



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,858	06/21/2006	Mitsunori Miki	IRD-0017	4120
23353 7590 05/15/2009 RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC LION BUILDING 1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501 WASHINGTON, DC 20036				
EXAMINER				
SWARTHOUT, BRENT				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2612				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/15/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/583,858

**Applicant(s)**

MIKI, MITSUNORI

**Examiner**

Brent A. Swarthout

**Art Unit**

2612

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7, 9-37 and 41-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7 and 9-37 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 41-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5108)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

1. Claims 44 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 44 and 46 ID information is said to be superposed on a light intensity, but such does not make sense since ID information is a form of data and no procedure for putting data on an intensity of light is set forth or capable of being performed. If applicant intended to state that ID data was superposed on a signal carrying light intensity data, then such should have been claimed instead.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 41-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleischmann in view of Kohar et al. and O'Dell

Fleischmann discloses a lighting control system comprising plural lights 12, a local device 20 with inherent transmission portion for transmitting lighting control instructions (Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 55-65), a receiver portion 26 which receives the transmitted light intensity control instruction and uses such instruction to control means 28 to control the intensity of light 12 (col. 5, lines 20-30), the lighting device to be controlled being specified by use of a selection ID (col. 3, lines 55-60), wherein the control means controls light intensity based on the instruction information transmitted by local device (col. 3, line 61), except for specifically stating that receiver is at a light

location or that light intensity control is performed by considering a comparison between sampled illumination and a target value.

Kohar teaches desirability in a system for remotely controlling lights of having receivers at the light locations (Fig. 1; col. 5, lines 50-55).

O'Dell teaches desirability in a lighting control system of comparing desired light level with actual light level in order that light control can adjust the level of light to a desired level (col. 1, line 65- col. 2, line 10).

It would have been obvious to utilize receivers at lighting locations as suggested by Kohar in conjunction with a system as disclosed by Fleischmann, in order to allow light units to be directly contacted without having to use hardwiring, thus saving on installation costs in buildings where it was desired to retrofit a lighting control system.

It would have been further obvious to use actual intensity level comparison with desired intensity level in order to allow a control to adjust intensity to desired level as suggested by O'Dell in conjunction with a lighting control system as disclosed by Fleischmann and Kohar, in order to allow light to be maintained at desired levels.

Regarding claims 41-46, Kohar teaches desirability of using optical signal (col. 4, lines 52-62) and directional characteristics of signal transmission/reception (col. 4, lines 58-65).

Regarding claim 41, since O'Dell teaches that stored illumination data is compared to sensed data (col. 3, lines 58-67), choosing to store light intensity at a

particular moment would have been obvious, merely depending on what desired lighting level was for a desired light source.

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 41-46 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3 of copending Application No. 10/567,081 in view of Fleischmann, Kohar et al. and O'Dell. Copending claims disclose a lighting control system where a sampled illumination is compared with a target illumination, and if they are different the light is controlled to correspond with the target level.

It would have been obvious to use illumination adjustment as suggested by the copending claims in conjunction with a lighting control system as disclosed by

Fleischmann, O'Dell and Kohar, in order to allow lighting in a building to be controlled to a desired level of illumination.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

4. Claims 5-7 and 9-37 are allowed.

5. Regarding remarks filed with the response on 2-5-09, on page 22 it is stated that newly filed claims 41-46 should be allowable since they share subject matter with allowable claims 5-7. However, newly filed claims do not share all the allowable subject matter with the allowed claims, and rather, contain similar subject matter to previously rejected claims 1-4.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent A. Swarthout whose telephone number is 571-272-2979. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th from 6:00 to 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Benjamin Lee, can be reached on 571-272-2963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Brent A Swarthout/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2612

Brent A Swarthout  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2612